


[Why Doubt 9/11?](#)
[Who Are We?](#)
[Press Releases](#)
[Resources](#)
[Links](#)
[Contact Us](#)
[Get Involved!](#)
[Login](#)
[Search](#)



[Home](#)
[Beginner?](#)
[Headlines](#)
[Events](#)
[Books](#)
[Papers](#)
[Articles](#)
[Media](#)
[Perspectives](#)
[Foreign Perspectives](#)
[New Postings](#)

29 SEPTEMBER 2007 - SCHOLARS' WTC REPORT APPEAL ACKNOWLEDGED BY NIST



Scholars' WTC Report Appeal acknowledged by NIST

Former Professor of Mechanical Engineering disputes official account

ABSTRACT. A former professor of mechanical engineering at Clemson University and a prominent member of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, has formally challenged the government's official explanation (jet plane impacts and jet fuel fires) as the cause of the destruction of the Twin Towers and other buildings at the World Trade Center. In her formal complaint, she asserts that directed energy weaponry was instead used to pulverize the Twin Towers.

Madison, WI (OpEdNews) September 29, 2007 -- In March 2007, Dr. Judy Wood, formerly of the Department of Mechanical Engineering at Clemson and a member of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, formally challenged the government's official explanation (jet impacts and resulting fires) for the destruction of the WTC complex. This was done in the form of a Request for Correction (RFC) relative to the Data Quality Act (DQA) under the guidance of Connecticut Attorney Jerry Leaphart. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) specifically acknowledged that it understood that Dr. Wood asserted that directed energy weapons (DEW) were used to destroy the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center complex. As well, NIST acknowledged that it did not analyze that part of the event where the destructive effects referenced by Dr. Wood would have been taking place.

NIST also acknowledged that it understood that Dr. Wood was asserting that some of NIST's contractors were in a position to confirm the use of DEW precisely because they, themselves, were manufacturers and developers of such weaponry. Among the contractors that NIST utilized to help it prepare the NCSTAR 1 report, for which corrections were sought, was Applied Research Associates, Inc., which, it turns out, is a founding sponsor of the Directed Energy Professional Society (DEPS).

Other sponsors of DEPS were also substantially involved in the preparation of NCSTAR 1 for NIST, including Science Applications International Corp (SAIC). NIST indicated that while it did a background check to assure there were no conflicts of interest, it did not know that ARA was a manufacturer of DEW. In her appeal, Dr. Wood presents ample information confirming that NIST should have known of ARA's involvement with DEW. Significantly, NIST has acknowledged Dr. Wood's appeal by posting a copy on its Website. "This means they are taking it seriously," Fetzer said.

In 2005, a number of reports were issued by NIST that were meant to explain how the Twin Towers were completely destroyed. Its basic report, designated NCSTAR 1, runs around 298 pages. She was able to pursue these issues under the DQA, because it directs the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to issue government-wide guidelines that "provide policy and procedural guidance to Federal agencies for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information (including statistical information) disseminated by Federal agencies."

On July 27, 2007, Attorney Jerry Leaphart observed on "The Dynamic Duo", a radio program hosted by Kevin Barrett, Ph.D., on GCN (gcnlive.com), "What I can tell you and the listeners, Kevin, is this. There is more admissible evidence associated with the theory that the World Trade Center was destroyed by directed energy weapons than there is admissible evidence for any single other theory out there that has been promulgated." This part of the show is available at http://drjudywood.com/media/070727_JerryLeaphartRFC_Adm.mp3. Fetzer, who co-hosts the program with Barrett, emphasized that this is a very important step on behalf of an alternative account of the mode of destruction of the WTC. "Indeed," he said, "the official account now hangs by very slender threads."

The first action initiated by Dr. Wood occurred in March 2007 in the form of an RFC declaring that NCSTAR 1 is "fraudulent and deceptive" because it cannot account for the profound destruction of the World Trade Center, including the massive pulverization of the towers, which she has documented on her web site, <http://drjudywood.com>. She observes, "NIST cannot make a statement that the World Trade Center towers came down in 'free fall,' on the one hand, and then say that doing so is a form of 'collapse,' on the other." According to Fetzer, not only is the use of the word "collapse" inaccurate but the official account does not satisfy the laws of physics and of engineering.

Several studies demonstrating that The 9/11 Commission Report (2004) is not true have been published in The 9/11 Conspiracy (2007), which Fetzer edited. From her analysis of the breadth and the depth of damage inflicted upon the WTC, Dr. Wood has concluded that some type of directed energy weapon (DEW) was involved in the destruction of the WTC buildings. She has also pointed out that Applied Research Associates (ARA) was a contractor in the preparation of some aspects of the NCSTAR reports and that ARA is also a manufacturer of directed energy weapons, which constitutes a probable "conflict of interest" in producing a truthful account of what happened here.

In a letter dated July 27, 2007, Catherine Fletcher of NIST commented on Dr. Wood's original RFC, stating, "NIST has examined the photographs you provided in conjunction with all the other evidence and has found that the evidence does not support a theory involving directed energy weapons." She also stated, "ARA was determined not to have an organizational conflict of interest". Finally, she added, "NIST is denying your request for correction because the NIST analysis of the initiation of the collapse of the WTC towers was thorough and based on all of the available evidence, and NIST continues to believe that the report is not fraudulent, deceptive or misleading."

The Data Quality Act, however, includes a "right of appeal" of NIST's response and Dr. Wood has worked to further document a significant conflict of interest between ARA and some of the analyses NIST used in its reports. In her appeal of August 22, 2007, Dr. Wood makes six key assertions, including that NIST should have known that Applied Research Associates (ARA) is "a significant manufacturer of directed energy weapons and/or components thereof." Additionally, Dr. Wood states, "NIST should have detected evidence of the use of such weaponry even in the context of NIST's intentional and, I assert, improper limitation of its investigation into 'the sequence of events leading up to the 'collapse' of the Twin Towers.'"

Fetzer said that a formal acknowledgement of the appeal has now been posted in two segments at http://www.ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/Information_Quality/PROD01_002619, which is the government's official web site. Due to technical issues, some of the documents are not available in their entirety. These will be corrected in time. Meanwhile the documents are available at http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST_RFC.html#wood. The posted versions, however, do not reproduce the evidence Dr. Wood has submitted, but only inferior black-and-white versions of photos. These photos may be viewed in higher resolution, color prints on her site, http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST_RFC.html#wood. "It is unfortunate that NIST has chosen to post a version with low quality pictures and in black and white," she observed. "Some of the data referenced in the appeal can only be properly evaluated when viewed in color and with good quality reproduction."

The appeal may be found at http://drjudywood.com/pdf/070822_RFC_Appeal17a_JW.pdf.

"I don't know why NIST did not simply post the higher quality color images," Fetzer said, "but they are available to the agency and to the public by means of her web site. The course of this appeal should be interesting." According to him, Dr. Wood is the leading scientist who is investigating the destruction of the WTC. "Judy's credentials are impeccable," he said. "She is an admirable example of what an expert can produce. Anyone who wants to understand what happened to the WTC should visit her web site. NIST has a great deal to learn from her."

James H. Fetzer
Founder
Scholars for 9/11 Truth


[< Prev](#)

[Next >](#)

[\[Back \]](#)


©2007 Scholars for 9/11 Truth - Questions? [Contact Us](#)

Why Doubt 9/11? Who Are We? Press Releases Resources Links Contact Us Get Involved! Login Search



Home Beginner? Headlines Events Books Papers Articles Media Perspectives Foreign Perspectives New Postings

1 July 2007 -NIST EXPLORING 9/11 CONSPIRACY THEORY FOR WTC-7: NEW WITNESS CONFIRMS SCHOLARS FINDINGS



NIST exploring 9/11 conspiracy theory for WTC-7

New witness confirms Scholars previous findings

Abstract: *The National Institute for Standards and Technology appears to be moving in the direction of a conspiracy theory about the destruction of WTC-7. This comes as a new witness reports explosions inside the building early that morning, long before the building would be destroyed at 5:20 PM. This reinforces Scholars for 9/11 Truth previous finding that WTC-7 was a controlled demolition, which the government is trying to conceal.*

Madison, WI (OpEdNews) 1 July 2007 – The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) appears to be moving in the direction of a "conspiracy theory" about the destruction of WTC-7 on 9/11 just as a new witness has emerged reporting extensive destruction inside the building many hours before it would be demolished. According to James Fetzer, the founder of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, these turns of events provide further confirmation for the conclusion that WTC-7 was brought down by a controlled demolition at 5:20 PM/ET. "Anyone who googles WTC-7 will see an event that looks exactly like a controlled demolition, just as Peter Jennings and Dan Rather reported at the time. That is why this event makes NIST so uncomfortable."

WTC-7, a 47-story building also known as the Soloman Brothers Building, collapsed about 7 hours after the Twin Towers were demolished. It was hit by no jet aircraft and had no jet-fuel based fires. "It did have a few modest fires, which could have been easily controlled but were allowed to burn," Fetzer said. "Remarkably, the fire alarm system in WTC-7 was turned off at 6:47 AM/ET and placed on 'TEST' status for a period of eight hours." In its latest press release (29 June 2007), NIST acknowledges that NIST is "considering whether hypothetical blast events could have played a role in initiating the collapse . . . (and) led to (WTC-7's) structural failure" (http://www.nist.gov/public_affairs/releases/wtc_062907.html).

A new eyewitness inside WTC-7 on the morning of 9/11, heard explosions before either of the Twin Towers collapsed. He was summoned to the Office of Emergency Management Operating Center (OEMOC), also known as "Rudy's Bunker," on the 23rd floor of the building. The center had been especially prepared for the Mayor and other officials to gather in case of a terrorist attack or other emergency. Some have wondered why Giuliani did not go to the OEMOC but instead remained some distance from the World Trade Center. This witness, who testified at official hearings and whose identity will be revealed in the general-theater-release version of "Loose Change," has information that sheds light on this and other questions about WTC-7.

Rolf Lindgren, former Vice-Chair of the Libertarian Party of Wisconsin and independent scholar of the events of 9/11, transcribed the testimony and edited it for clarity of English. The complete transcript is below. The witness went to WTC-7 after the first plane struck the North Tower and before the second hit the South Tower. When he arrived at the 23rd floor, he found half-eaten sandwiches and still-steaming coffee. He made some phone calls and was told to leave "right away." Someone ran into the Center and led him to a stairwell. "When we reached the 6th floor, the landing that we were standing on gave way; there was an explosion and the landing gave way." He had to climb back up to the 8th floor to find a way out. When he got to the lobby, "the lobby was totally destroyed. It looked like King Kong had come through and stepped on it.. And it was so destroyed I didn't know where I was . . . (and) they had to take me out through a hole in the wall, . . . a hole that I believe the fire department made to get me out."

WTC-7 has been widely regarded within the 9/11 research community as the most blatant of all "smoking guns" that disprove the official account. According to David Ray Griffin, a member of Scholars for 9/11 Truth and the movement's leading representative, the building showed all the characteristics of a controlled demolition: an abrupt, complete, and total collapse at freefall speed, which was perfectly symmetrical and into its own foundation, as he has explained in his latest book, *Debunking 9/11 Debunking* (2007). "The 'blast events' this witness is describing are not 'hypothetical,' Fetzer observed, "but actual. Only actual events can bring about effects. So it's a bit labored for NIST to say it's considering whether 'hypothetical' blast events could have played a role in initiating the collapse. They could not. That requires real blast events."

The witness, who was interviewed by Dylan Avery (with audio clips played on Alex Jones' and on Dylan's shows), has expressed his puzzlement over the destruction of the building. "Well, I'm just confused about one thing and one thing only," he said, "why World Trade Center 7 went down in the first place? I'm very confused about that. I know what I heard; I heard explosions. The explanation I got was it was the fuel oil tank. I'm an old boiler guy. If it was the fuel oil tank, it would have been one side of the building." But the collapse was symmetrical. "There was a large tank of diesel in the building," Fetzer said, "but diesel burns at a low temperature and diesel is not explosive. It cannot have brought about this collapse."

Anyone who has watched the building come down appreciates that it has all of the characteristics of a controlled demolition. Even James Glanz, a reporter for The New York Times, admitted in an early story (29 November 2001) that the collapse of WTC-7 is even more perplexing than is the destruction of the Twin Towers, because no reinforced, steel structure high-rise building had ever collapsed due to fire in the history of structural engineering. "Indeed, no steel structure rise collapsed due to fire before 9/11 nor after 9/11 – nor, if our research is correct, on 9/11," Fetzer said. "None of these fires burned long enough or hot enough to cause steel to weaken, much less melt. It must be embarrassing for the scientists at the NIST to defend these ridiculous theories."

Lindgren, who has extensive experience with press releases, added, "Friday afternoon is the best time of the week for the government to bury unpleasant news. Since NIST insists it has found 'no evidence' of a controlled demolition, it must not consider the videos of WTC-7's collapse as 'evidence,' because they leave no room for doubt. The fires in Building 7 provide a good cover story to hide the fact that powerful explosives brought it down." He is also not impressed with Giuliani's excuse for not going to his command center, which is that another plane could have been headed for it. "But if another plane was headed toward the World Trade Center, then he should have directed that the firemen be removed from all the buildings, which he did not do." (See [http://www.cooperativeresearch.org/entity.jsp?entity=rudolf_\(rudolf\)_giuliani](http://www.cooperativeresearch.org/entity.jsp?entity=rudolf_(rudolf)_giuliani)).

There were other oddities related to WTC-7, including Larry Silverstein reporting (during a PBS interview) that he had suggested to the fire commander that the best thing to do might be to "pull it" (where, he said, "They made the decision to pull, and we watched the building come down") and the BBC broadcast of a report of the collapse of "the Solomon Brothers Building" at least 23 minutes before the event would actually occur. "This was stunning," Fetzer said, "because you could see WTC-7 in the background over her left shoulder as she reported its collapse. It is hard to imagine a more revealing demonstration of the entanglement of the intelligence agencies, the administration, and the mass media. And a 'terrorism drill' was scheduled for the next day." The PBS interview and the BBC report are archived on the Scholars site at 911scholars.org.

"If Rosie O'Donnell had talked about 'blast events initiating the collapse of WTC-7', Fetzer said, "she would have been labeled a 'conspiracy theorist.' But then the official government account of 19 Islamic fundamentalists hijacking four commercial airlines, outfoxing the most sophisticated air defense system in the world to perpetrate these atrocities under the control of a guy in a cave in Afghanistan is only the most 'outrageous' conspiracy theory of them all. I guess we should be grateful that NIST is moving inch by inch toward a more adequate explanation of what actually happened on 9/11, which bears no relationship at all to what we have been told. Given the cumulative evidence, we are not 'conspiracy theorists' but 'conspiracy realists.'"

WTC 7 Eyewitness Testimony Transcribed by Rolf Lindgren (edited for clarity with notes)

Sources: <http://www.prisonplanet.com/audio/190607clips2.mp3>

<http://69.80.230.7/Archives2/Jun2007/gwrpt1erT/0619071.mp3>

<http://69.80.230.7/Archives2/Jun2007/gwrpt1erT/0619072.mp3>

[Start of transcript]

"I was asked to go and man the Office of Emergency Management [OEM] at the World Trade Center 7, on the 23rd floor.

[This was immediately after the North Tower was struck. OEM is also known as Rudy's Bunker.]

As I arrived there, there were police all over the lobby.

They showed me the way to the elevator; we got up to the 23rd floor.

We couldn't get in; we had to go back down. [The witness was with another person.]

Then security and police took us to the freight elevators where they took us back up and we did get in.

Upon arriving into the OEMEOC [OEM Emergency Operating Center], we noticed that everybody was gone.

[The witness's voice inflection indicates elevated surprise. It seems he has arrived before the official evacuation time of 9:30 AM]

I saw coffee that was on the desks still, the smoke was still coming off the coffee.

I saw half-eaten sandwiches.

And after I called several individuals, one individual told me to leave and to leave right away.

[Could indicate foreknowledge]

I came running back in.

He said we're the only ones up here.

We gotta get out of here. He found the stairwell.

So we subsequently went to the stairwell and we're going down the stairs.

When we reached the 6th floor, the landing that we were standing on gave way, there was an explosion and the landing gave way.

[The witness's timeline places this event well before the collapse of either Twin Tower.]

I was left there hanging.

I had to climb back up, and now I had to walk back up to the 8th floor.

After getting to the 8th floor everything was dark."

[However, according to FEMA maps, none of the South Tower debris, excepting dust clouds, reached Building 7. (Source: http://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403_ch1.pdf, esp. p. 9). The North Tower did not collapse until 10:28 A.M., far too late to fit into the witness' timeline.]

"As I told you earlier, both buildings were still standing. Because I looked to, I looked one way, looked the other way, there's nothing there.

When I got to the 6th floor before all this happened, I got to the 6th floor, there was an explosion, that's what forced us back to the 8th floor, both buildings were still standing."

[The above two paragraphs were obtained from another source not listed above. For this source, please contact the Scholars.]

....

"Well, I'm just confused about one thing and one thing only, why World Trade Center 7 went down in the first place? I'm very confused about that.

I know what I heard; I heard explosions.

The explanation I got was it was the fuel oil tank. I'm an old boiler guy. If it was the fuel oil tank, it would have been one side of the building.

When I got to that lobby, the lobby was totally destroyed.

It looked like King Kong had came through and stepped on it.

And it was so destroyed I didn't know where I was.

And it was so destroyed that they had to take me out through a hole in the wall.

A makeshift hole that I believe that the fire department made to get me out."

[The damage to the lobby may have been related to the earlier explosion or possibly be related to the destruction of the North Tower, a point that will be resolved when the entire tape is released.]

.....
"And it wasn't until some years later that I testified in front of them [9/11 Commission or NIST].

It was very scary because they looked like very important people; they were questioning me about certain things.

I don't know if they liked the answers I gave, I could care less, I gave what, my account of it, the truth, and that was that.

I thought they were just doing an interim report or investigation on as to what happened. They got my point of view.

I haven't heard any more from them."

[End of transcript]

James Fetzer
Founder
Scholars for 9/11 Truth

[< Prev](#)

[Next >](#)

[\[Back \]](#)

©2007 Scholars for 9/11 Truth - Questions? [Contact Us](#)



[Home](#) [Learn More](#) [Release Features](#) [Success Stories](#) [Search Archives](#) [PRWeb Direct](#) [Submit Release](#)

[Industry Categories](#) [News by Country](#) [News by MSA](#) [Today's News](#) [Browse by Day](#) [PR Trackbacks™](#) [ViewNews™](#)

[All Press Releases for March 30, 2007](#)

Subscribe to this News Feed

Scholars file challenges to NIST reports on 9/11

OPTIONS

Submissions may shatter the cover-up, founder declares

Madison, WI (PRWEB) March 30, 2007 - Some members of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, a non-partisan organization of students, experts and scholars dedicated to exposing falsehoods and revealing truths about 9/11, have filed complaints against the National Institute of Standards and Technology for legal defects in its studies of events of 9/11 involving the Twin Towers and Building 7. James H. Fetzer, the society's founder, believes these actions have the potential to break the back of the cover-up that has enveloped these events.

- Printer Friendly Version
- Download PDF Version
- Download Reader Version
- BlogThis
- ShareIt

"It would be nice if the government would tell us the truth about our own history," Fetzer said. "But all we get from the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State and former Secretary of Defense is a 'song and dance' that keeps the American people in ignorance." The complaints have been filed by Ed Haas, who edits The Muckraker Report; Morgan Reynolds, past Chief Economist in the Department of Labor in the Bush administration; and Judy Wood, former professor of mechanical engineering at Clemson University. Reynolds and Wood are both members of the society.

CONTACT INFORMATION

JAMES FETZER

Scholars for 9/11 Truth

[Visit Our Site](#)

(608) 835-2707

[Email us Here](#)

The complaints, which are archived and available to the public at

www.ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/information_Quality/PROD01-002619.

fall into three categories. The complaint by Ed Haas concerns claims that NIST has advanced asserting that it has found "no evidence of a blast or controlled demolition event" in relation to Building 7. Haas alleges that this is false and misleading insofar as NIST has never looked for evidence of this kind. Moreover, NIST denies having found any "corroborating evidence" supporting the hypothesis that the building was brought down by controlled demolition, which is inconsistent with evidence it acknowledges.

These outcomes appear to be inexplicable if only conventional explosives, much less fires, were involved

ATTACHED FILES

There are no multimedia files attached to this release. If this is your release, you may add images or other multimedia files through your login.

Indeed, in his complaint, Haas observes that the gross features of the collapse of Building 7 — a 6.6 second, complete, symmetrical, and total collapse — qualify as evidence of controlled demolition of that building, which contradicts NIST's affirmations. In a second complaint, Haas observes that conflicts of interest affect using many of the same scientists, experts, subcontractors, and others who were responsible for research on the Twin Towers to conduct research on Building 7 as well, which tends to taint their objectivity.

"Building 7 has been of special interest lately," Fetzer remarked, "since archival footage from the BBC has been discovered, where a female reporter is explaining that Building 7 has also collapsed." The problem is that the building only collapsed at 5:20 PM, while she is reporting it at 4:57 PM, which is 23 minutes too soon. "You can find a dozen articles about it on 911scholars.org, which is the society's web site. You can even see Building 7 clearly standing in the background over her left shoulder in these news video clips, which raises disturbing questions about the media in all of this."

The second complaint, which has been filed by Morgan Reynolds, disputes NIST's

ABOUT PRESS RELEASES

If you have any questions regarding information in these press releases please contact the company listed in the press release. Please do not contact PRWeb. We will be unable to assist you with your inquiry. PRWeb disclaims any content contained in these releases. Our complete disclaimer appears here.

explanations of the jetliner-shaped holes in the Twin Towers. According to NIST, the North Tower (WTC-1) was hit by Flight AA 11, a Boeing 767, traveling at an estimated 443 mph, yet its tail section disappears within 0.25 seconds. And it claims that the South Tower (WTC-2) was hit by Flight UA 175, another Boeing 767, flying at an estimated speed of 542 mph, where its tail section disappears into the building in approximately 0.20 seconds.

Reynolds observes that the planes are 159 feet in length, which means that, on the NIST account, Flight AA 11 lost only 2% of its speed in despite massive resistance from a steel/concrete building. Similarly for Flight UA 175, the airspeed of which did not decline in spite of its impact with steel walls and concrete floors, as well as the dense steel core consisting of 47 columns. The complaint contends that real jetliners would have been dramatically slowed by the impact, which implies that the NIST report is not only factually wrong but also physically impossible in violating physical laws.

"Morgan poses a substantial number of anomalies that NIST will be hard pressed to explain," Fetzer said. "But the greatest challenge to its scientific integrity is posed by the complaint filed by Judy Wood, which is a veritable tour de force." While the documents filed by Haas and Reynolds run less than ten pages in length, the one filed by Wood runs forty-three pages, including photographs and other supporting evidence. "It is a powerful critique that demonstrates the government has completely and utterly failed to explain what happened to the World Trade Center on that tragic and fateful day."

Fetzer characterizes Dr. Wood, who has degrees in civil engineering, engineering mechanics, and materials engineering science, as the leading expert on technical aspects of the destruction of the World Trade Center. "There are experts in many areas of science and of engineering studying 9/11," he explained, "but she has degrees that are centrally focused on critical areas in which competence is required to begin to understand what happened on 9/11. No one else in the 9/11 community comes close to her level of expertise."

Her complaint, technically, Request for Correction, like the others, asserts that the basic integrity of NIST's report, called NCSTAR 1, is lacking because, by its own admission, NIST did not investigate the actual destruction of the World Trade Center Towers: "The focus of the investigation was on the sequence of events from the instance of aircraft impact to the initiation of collapse for each tower." This means that the NIST report does not actually include the collapse behavior of the towers after the conditions for their initiation were realized, which NIST refers to as "the probable collapse sequence."

"NIST, of course, claims that it was the impact of the aircraft and the jet-fuel based fires, which caused the steel to weaken and bring about a collapse," Fetzer said. "But the buildings were designed to withstand such occurrences and the steel had been certified by UL to 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit for several hours without weakening. The fires only burned around 500 degrees for less than an hour (in the case of WTC-2) and an hour-and-a-half (in the case of WTC-2), so NIST really doesn't even reach the point at which a 'collapse' of any kind would be 'initiated.' The situation is quite remarkable."

Thus, to this day, Americans have not been given any explanation whatsoever for the destruction of the WTC complex that comports with information and quality standards. In contrast, Dr. Wood's RFC contains a stunning array of visual evidence that confirms highly unusual energy effects seen by all as the Twin Towers were almost instantaneously destroyed in less time than it would take a billiard ball to hit the ground if dropped from the height of 110 stories, a result she demonstrates in relation to the law of falling bodies.

Wood also points out other compelling evidence that NIST ignored, including visual evidence of unusual and unexplained devastation to vehicles parked blocks away from the WTC complex, including some with disintegrated engine blocks but unexploded gas tanks. And she notes the peculiar damage of perpendicular gouges in WTC-3, WTC-4, WTC-5, and WTC-6, as well as other distinctive effects, such as cylindrical holes in these buildings and even in the street, which remain unexplained by NIST to this day. "These outcomes appear to be inexplicable if only conventional explosives, much less fires, were involved," Fetzer said. "Cars burned, paper did not."

Indeed, Wood goes further and points out that the huge quantity of dust resulting from the visible process of steel disintegration, some of which was captured on film, combined with these other effects suggest the probable use of high-tech, directed energy weapons.

Another element of Wood's proof is the almost complete lack of even a rubble pile at the WTC complex. "Where did it go?", she asks. Whatever the source of energy and heat may have been, it had no effect upon massive quantities of paper floating around the city.

Jerry Leaphart, a Connecticut-based trial lawyer, who is also a member of Scholars, represents the complainants in this effort. Leaphart states that NIST now has 60 days to respond to the RFC. After that, an appeal can be taken or other legal action could be pursued. "Anyone with a serious interest in what happened at the World Trade Center has to read Wood's complaint," Fetzer added. "It is a stunning indictment of the NIST's failure to come to grips with the problem. In my opinion, these submissions have the potential to shatter the cover-up in one of the greatest murder mysteries in history. We are all indebted to them for doing this."

###

Post Comment:

Trackback URL:

<http://www.prweb.com/pingpr.php/RmFsdS1lYWxmLVN1bW0tRmFsdS1NYWduLVplcm8=>



[9/11 nist government cover-up requests for correction ed haas morgan reynolds judy wood jerry leaphart jim fetzer scholars for 9/11 truth](#)

Bookmark - [Del.icio.us](#) | [Digg](#) | [Furl It](#) | [Spurl](#) | [RawSugar](#) | [Simpy](#) | [Shadows](#) | [Blink It](#) | [My Web](#)

Disclaimer: If you have any questions regarding information in these press releases please contact the company listed in the press release. Please do not contact PRWeb®. We will be unable to assist you with your inquiry. PRWeb® disclaims any content contained in these releases. Our complete disclaimer appears here.

© Copyright 1997-2007, Vocus PRW Holdings, LLC.
Vocus, PRWeb and Publicity Wire are trademarks or registered trademarks of [Vocus, Inc.](#) or Vocus PRW Holdings, LLC.

[Terms of Service](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Copyright](#)

9/11 Scholar files "Qui Tam" lawsuit against NIST

Friday, October 12th 2007

By Jim Fetzer

Madison, WI (OpEdNews) October 11, 2007 – According to James H. Fetzer, founder of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, on September 12, 2007, the day after the sixth anniversary of the attacks on the World Trade Center (WTC), Federal Judge George B. Daniels of the Southern District of New York signed a court order "unsealing" a 9/11 complaint filed by Dr. Judy Wood against the National Institute of Standards and Technology on April 25, 2007. "This may prove to be a crucial turning points in exposing the official cover-up of what actually happened on that tragic day," observed Fetzer.

The complaint alleges that contractors hired by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), an agency of the U.S. Department of Commerce, violated the so-called False Claims Act in their work originally intended to "determine why and how WTC 1 and WTC 2 collapsed following the initial impacts of the aircraft." Dr. Wood is suing on behalf of the United States of America because the U. S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York, which represents "the government," declined to intervene in the case, a so-called "Qui Tam" lawsuit, Fetzer said.

With the case unsealed, steps in the litigation now can be reported to the public in the same matter as any lawsuit pending in a federal court, according to Jerry V. Leaphart, Attorney at Law, who is representing Dr. Wood in these proceedings. Leaphart, who has been admitted to the bar in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, recognized that the situation was ripe for a Qui tam suit in light of Dr. Wood's research, which contradicts the official NIST report.

According to Leaphart, Qui Tam is a legal provision under the False Claims Act (31 U.S.C. #3729 et seq.) that allows private persons, including those who are known as "whistleblowers," who possess knowledge of frauds committed against the United States to bring suits on its behalf. "When the nation won't act on its own behalf," he added, "Qui Tam provides the means for citizens to compel the government to fulfill its own duties and obligations under the law."

"NIST was hanging out with the wrong crowd," according to Dr. Wood. "Apparently the people hired to do the work of figuring out how the Twin Towers disappeared convinced NIST to focus on something else. NIST admitted to me in writing that it deliberately did

not investigate the actual unraveling of the WTC." In its letter of July 27, 2007, to Wood NIST acknowledged, "NIST only investigated the factors leading to the initiation of the collapses of the WTC towers, not the collapses themselves."

Dr. Wood holds degrees in Civil Engineering, Engineering Mechanics, and Materials Engineering Science. Fetzner added, "She is a former assistant professor in the Department of Mechanical Engineering at Clemson University and is arguably the best qualified 9/11 researcher in the world. I know of no one else whose qualifications come close to matching hers."

Dr. Wood is well known in the 9/11 truth movement for alleging fraud and requesting correction of the official report prepared by NIST. In her recent Appeal of her Request for Correction (RFC), Wood presented compelling evidence that the Twin Towers were destroyed by Directed Energy Weapons (DEW).

She has also discovered that companies heavily invested in developing and manufacturing such black technology were also hired to work on the NIST project. They appear to have ignored evidence of DEW all around them, instead using their expertise to cover up the kind of weaponry employed.

Although NIST declined to correct NCSTAR 1 as demanded by Dr. Wood, NIST did respond in part by providing a specific definition of what it meant by the word "collapse" in its original report, NCSTAR 1, namely:

"a falling in, loss of shape, or reduction to flattened form or rubble of a structure."

This definition, however, turns out to be at odds with the basic premise of NCSTAR 1, insofar as the NIST never actually studied the events that fall within the scope of this novel definition. "That is fraud," declared Dr. Wood (<http://www.drjudywood.com/#news>)

"Indeed," said Fetzner, who recently retired as a professor of philosophy after 35 years of college teaching, "that definition would even be consistent with the destruction of the building by means of a nuclear explosion, which flattened it and turned it to rubble. NIST did not explain how it happened."

Dr. Wood's federal Qui tam case asserts that the corporate and individual defendants committed actionable fraud under the False Claims Act. Her lawsuit seeks reimbursement of monies paid, penalties and interest.

"The most shocking claim," Attorney Leaphart has observed, "may be that some of the defendants include those actually involved in development and manufacture of directed energy weapons and the development of covert psychological operations, which Wood claims were key ingredients in the events of 9/11." Her complaint states, in part:

"[The] defendants...committed fraud in seeking to have NCSTAR 1 deceive the public into not recognizing that WTC1, 2 could not reasonably or possibly have been destroyed in the manner seen absent the use of DEW. Some of the defendants knew as much; other defendants either knew or if they did not, they should have known. To the extent they did not know, such ignorance was willful, intentional and actionable under the False Claims Act."

Leaphart's office has already served the defendants with notice of the complaint that has been filed against them. Defendants named include Applied Research Associates (ARA), Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), and Underwriters Laboratories, among others. "This should be very interesting," said Fetzer. "I predict you'll be hearing more about it. We are burrowing deeper and deeper into the reality of 9/11."

Authors Website: 911scholars.org

Authors Bio: Founder, Scholars for 9/11 Truth

Design and Original Content Copyright © 2005 - 2006 Independent American Party of Nevada

[Why Doubt 9/11?](#)
[Who Are We?](#)
[Press Releases](#)
[Resources](#)
[Links](#)
[Contact Us](#)
[Get Involved!](#)
[Login](#)
[Search](#)

[Home](#)
[Beginner?](#)
[Headlines](#)
[Events](#)
[Books](#)
[Papers](#)
[Articles](#)
[Media](#)
[Perspectives](#)
[Foreign Perspectives](#)

29 SEPTEMBER 2007 - SCHOLARS' WTC REPORT APPEAL ACKNOWLEDGED BY NIST



Scholars' WTC Report Appeal acknowledged by NIST

Former Professor of Mechanical Engineering disputes current account

ABSTRACT. A former professor of mechanical engineering at Clemson University and a prominent member of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, formally challenged the government's official explanation (jet plane impacts and jet fuel fires) as the cause of the destruction of the World Trade Center and other buildings at the World Trade Center. In her formal complaint, she asserts that directed energy weaponry was instead the cause of the destruction.

Madison, WI (OpEdNews) September 29, 2007 – In March 2007, Dr. Judy Wood, formerly of the Department of Mechanical Engineering at Clemson and a member of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, formally challenged the government's official explanation (jet impacts and jet fuel fires) as the cause of the destruction of the WTC complex. This was done in the form of a Request for Correction (RFC) relative to the Data Quality of the guidance of Connecticut Attorney Jerry Leaphart. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) specifically understood that Dr. Wood asserted that directed energy weapons (DEW) were used to destroy the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center complex. As well, NIST acknowledged that it did not analyze that part of the event where the destructive effects referenced in the report have been taking place.

NIST also acknowledged that it understood that Dr. Wood was asserting that some of NIST's contractors were in a position to use DEW precisely because they, themselves, were manufacturers and developers of such weaponry. Among the contractors that helped it prepare the NCSTAR 1 report, for which corrections were sought, was Applied Research Associates, Inc., which, it turned out, was a sponsor of the Directed Energy Professional Society (DEPS).

Other sponsors of DEPS were also substantially involved in the preparation of NCSTAR 1 for NIST, including Science Applications, Inc. (SAIC). NIST indicated that while it did a background check to assure there were no conflicts of interest, it did not know of SAIC's involvement as a manufacturer of DEW. In her appeal, Dr. Wood presents ample information confirming that NIST should have known of SAIC's involvement with DEW. Significantly, NIST has acknowledged Dr. Wood's appeal by posting a copy on its Website. "This means they are taking it seriously," Fetzner said.

In 2005, a number of reports were issued by NIST that were meant to explain how the Twin Towers were completely destroyed. Designated NCSTAR 1, runs around 298 pages. She was able to pursue these issues under the DQA, because it directs the Management and Budget (OMB) to issue government-wide guidelines that "provide policy and procedural guidance to Federal agencies ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information (including statistical information) disseminated by Federal agencies."

On July 27, 2007, Attorney Jerry Leaphart observed on "The Dynamic Duo", a radio program hosted by Kevin Barrett, Ph.D., (gcnlive.com), "What I can tell you and the listeners, Kevin, is this. There is more admissible evidence associated with the theory that the Trade Center was destroyed by directed energy weapons than there is admissible evidence for any single other theory out there that has been promulgated." This part of the show is available at http://drjudywood.com/media/070727_JerryLeaphartRFC_Adm.mp3. Fetzer's program with Barrett, emphasized that this is a very important step on behalf of an alternative account of the mode of destruction. "Indeed," he said, "the official account now hangs by very slender threads."

The first action initiated by Dr. Wood occurred in March 2007 in the form of an RFC declaring that NCSTAR 1 is "fraudulent and misleading" because it cannot account for the profound destruction of the World Trade Center, including the massive pulverization of the towers. As she has documented on her web site, <http://drjudywood.com>. She observes, "NIST cannot make a statement that the World Trade Center came down in 'free fall,' on the one hand, and then say that doing so is a form of 'collapse,' on the other." According to Fetzer, the use of the word "collapse" is inaccurate but the official account does not satisfy the laws of physics and of engineering.

Several studies demonstrating that The 9/11 Commission Report (2004) is not true have been published in The 9/11 Conspiracy by Catherine Fletcher, edited by Dr. Wood. From her analysis of the breadth and the depth of damage inflicted upon the WTC, Dr. Wood has concluded that a directed energy weapon (DEW) was involved in the destruction of the WTC buildings. She has also pointed out that Applied Research Associates (ARA) was a contractor in the preparation of some aspects of the NCSTAR reports and that ARA is also a manufacturer of directed energy weapons, which constitutes a probable "conflict of interest" in producing a truthful account of what happened here.

In a letter dated July 27, 2007, Catherine Fletcher of NIST commented on Dr. Wood's original RFC, stating, "NIST has examined the evidence you provided in conjunction with all the other evidence and has found that the evidence does not support a theory involving directed energy weapons." She also stated, "ARA was determined not to have an organizational conflict of interest". Finally, she added, "NIST has requested a correction because the NIST analysis of the initiation of the collapse of the WTC towers was thorough and based on the available evidence, and NIST continues to believe that the report is not fraudulent, deceptive or misleading."

The Data Quality Act, however, includes a "right of appeal" of NIST's response and Dr. Wood has worked to further document the conflict of interest between ARA and some of the analyses NIST used in its reports. In her appeal of August 22, 2007, Dr. Wood makes several assertions, including that NIST should have known that Applied Research Associates (ARA) is "a significant manufacturer of directed energy weapons and/or components thereof." Additionally, Dr. Wood states, "NIST should have detected evidence of the use of such weapons in the context of NIST's intentional and, I assert, improper limitation of its investigation into 'the sequence of events leading up to the collapse of the Twin Towers.'"

Fetzer said that a formal acknowledgement of the appeal has now been posted in two segments at http://www.ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/Information_Quality/PROD01_002619, which is the government's official version of the technical issues, some of the documents are not available in their entirety. These will be corrected in time. Meanwhile the documents are available at http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST_RFC.html#wood. The posted versions, however, do not reproduce the versions Dr. Wood has submitted, but only inferior black-and-white versions of photos. These photos may be viewed in higher resolution, at the site, http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST_RFC.html#wood. "It is unfortunate that NIST has chosen to post a version with low resolution pictures and in black and white," she observed. "Some of the data referenced in the appeal can only be properly evaluated with high resolution and with good quality reproduction."

The appeal may be found at http://drjudywood.com/pdf/070822_RFC_Appeal17a_JW.pdf.

"I don't know why NIST did not simply post the higher quality color images," Fetzer said, "but they are available to the agency through the means of her web site. The course of this appeal should be interesting." According to him, Dr. Wood is the leading scientist in the field.

the destruction of the WTC. "Judy's credentials are impeccable," he said. "She is an admirable example of what an expert c who wants to understand what happened to the WTC should visit her web site. NIST has a great deal to learn from her."


James H. Fetzer
Founder
Scholars for 9/11 Truth

[< Prev](#)

[Next >](#)

[\[Back \]](#)

©2007 Scholars for 9/11 Truth - Questions? [Contact Us](#)

Search: ☒ The Web ☐ Tripod  PlayPhone* [Report Abuse](#) « [Previous](#) | [Top](#)
100 | [Next](#) »

Hosted



Morgan Reynolds+press

GO GET IT!

share: [del.icio.us](#) | [digg](#) | [reddit](#) | [furl](#) | [facebook](#)

Ads by Google

[Bottom](#) [homepage](#) [CriticsCorner](#) [FAQ](#)[Press
Release](#)[DQA-NIST](#)[Whistleblower
Information](#)[Scientific
Method](#)[Why
Indeed](#)[Billiard
Balls](#)[Star Wars Beam
Weapon](#)

REQUESTS FOR CORRECTION OF NIST REPORT ON DESTRUCTION OF WORLD TRADE CENTER FILED

FRAUD AND DECEPTION CITED AS REASONS FOR CORRECTION REQUEST

March 22, 2007

CONTACT: Dr. Judy Wood or Attorney Jerry Leaphart 203-825-6265

For Immediate Release:

Basic Facts:

A Request for Correction (RFC) submitted under the Data Quality Act (DQA) was filed with National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) on March 16, 2007

NIST acknowledged receipt of RFC in writing on March 19, 2007, via its Acting Chief of Management and Organization Division, Stephen Willett.

RFC challenges the integrity of NIST document NCSTAR 1 (National Construction Safety Team Advisory Committee), Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers, issued in September 2005

See www.wtc.nist.gov

A full copy of the RFC filed by DR. Wood can be viewed at

<http://janedoe0911.tripod.com/NIST RFC.html>

Dr. Judy Wood (with degrees in Civil Engineering, Engineering Mechanics, and Materials Engineering Science), widely acknowledged as the leading proponent of the theory that Directed Energy Weapons (DEW) were used to destroy the World Trade Center (WTC) complex, has filed a Request for Correction under the Data Quality Act with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), located in Gaithersburg, MD.

Dr. Wood is represented in this effort by Attorney Jerry Leaphart, a Connecticut-based trial lawyer, who states that NIST now has 60 days to respond to the RFC. After that, an appeal can be taken and/or other legal action may then follow.

Leaphart further states that Dr. Wood knows that the implications of her theory that DEW were used to destroy the WTC complex shatter certain key beliefs that Americans as a whole cherish and hold dear. Her theory has generated a lot of interest and commentary within the 9/11 Truth Movement that relies primarily upon the Internet as its media source. Mainstream print and broadcast media do not cover the 9/11 Truth Movement, but may need to take heed of this administrative action filed by Dr. Wood, according to Attorney Leaphart.

Leaphart said that to his knowledge, only three RFCs concerning NIST's WTC report have been filed to date. One by Dr. Morgan Reynolds, another by Edward F. Haas and the one filed by Dr. Wood. All three are currently pending.

The 43 page RFC filed by Wood asserts that the basic integrity of NCSTAR 1 is lacking because, by its own admission, it did not investigate the actual destruction of the World Trade Center Towers.

NCSTAR 1 admits:

"The focus of the investigation was on the sequence of events from the instance of aircraft impact to the initiation of collapse for each tower. For brevity in this report, this sequence is referred to as the "probable collapse sequence," although it does not actually include the structural behavior of the tower after the conditions for collapse initiation were reached and collapse became inevitable." [See NCSTAR 1, pgs xxxvii, footnote 2 and/or 82, footnote 13]

E.1 Genesis of this investigation

p. xxxv-xxxvi (pp. 37-38): *"The specific objectives were:*

1. Determine why and how WTC 1 and WTC 2 collapsed following the initial impacts of the aircraft and why and how WTC 7 collapsed; ..."

E.2 Approach

p. xxxvii (p. 39) footnote² *"The focus of the Investigation was on the sequence of events from the instant of aircraft impact to the initiation of collapse for each tower. For brevity in this report, this sequence is referred to as the probable collapse sequence," although it includes little analysis of the structural behavior of the tower after the conditions for collapse initiation were reached and collapse became inevitable.*

Thus, to this day, Americans have not been given any explanation whatsoever for the destruction of the WTC complex that comports with information and quality standards.

In contrast, Dr. Wood's RFC contains a stunning array of visual evidence confirming highly unusual energy effects seen by all as the twin towers were almost instantaneously destroyed in less time than it would take a billiard ball to hit the ground if dropped from the height of the twin towers.

That fact is assessed on the basis of the two other laws of physics in Wood's RFC, thus confirming its scientific rigor. Wood also points to other compelling evidence that NIST ignored. Wood's RFC shows visual evidence of unusual and unexplained blast effects on vehicles parked blocks away from the complex. Wood also demonstrates unexplained visual damage in the form of perpendicular gouges in WTC 3, and WTC 4,5,6 and the near disappearance of WTC 3, all of which remain unexplained by NIST to this day. Wood goes further and points out that the incredible amount of dust resulting from the visible process of steel disintegrating before our very eyes all point to the use of directed energy weapons. One other element of Wood's proof is the almost complete lack of even a rubble pile at the WTC complex. Wood asks: Where did it go?

Added to all of that is the fact that whatever the energy and heat source was, it had no effect upon paper that was seen floating everywhere and not burning very much, if at all.


Dr. Wood's RFC demonstrates all of the above mentioned effects in its 43 pages of text and pictorial proof. The combined effects of gravity, jet fuel (a form of kerosene) and plane damage could not possibly have caused the massive destruction that occurred on September 11, 2001, in New York City, according to Dr. Wood. The wonder of it all is that more engineers and scientists have not come forward to challenge the woeful, scientific inadequacies of the official explanation.

Dr. Wood invites her peers and colleagues to set aside their emotional attachments and to view the evidence objectively. Then and only then can America come to grips with what happened on 9/11/01, according to Dr. Wood.

[Top](#) [homepage](#) [CriticsCorner](#) [FAQ](#) [Press Release](#) [DOA-NIST](#) [Whistleblower Information](#) [Scientific Method](#) [Why Indeed](#) [Billiard Balls](#) [Star Wars Beam Weapon](#)

In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the articles posted on this webpage are distributed for their included information without profit for research and/or educational purposes only. This webpage has no affiliation whatsoever with the original sources of the articles nor are we sponsored or endorsed by any of the original sources.

© 2006-2007 Judy Wood and the author above. All rights reserved.



Press Release -- NIST-RFC

http://janedoe0911.tripod.com/070322_PR.html

Site Sponsors



Home Links News Audio Video About Order DVDs

Home ► 9-11 and Fake Terror ► Activism ► Press Release - Professors Make Legal Challenges to NIST 9/11 World Trade Centre Report

Press Release - Professors Make Legal Challenges to NIST 9/11 World Trade Centre Report

Professors Make Legal Challenges to NIST 9/11 World Trade Centre Report

5th Sept, 2007 Hot Springs Village - Arkansas, Clemson - South Carolina, Danbury - Connecticut. In separate actions, 2 professors have initiated legal challenges against the report that supposedly explained how and why World Trade Centre towers 1 & 2 were destroyed on Sept 11 2001. Professor Morgan Reynolds, using various points of evidence, challenges the assumption that large jet planes hit the towers. Professor Judy Wood challenges the stated cause (jet impacts and resulting fires) for the destruction of the entire WTC complex. Professor Wood has uncovered various items of evidence which have allowed her to declare that NCSTAR1 is "fraudulent and deceptive".

In 2005, a number of reports were issued by NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) which were meant to explain how the World Trade Centre towers were completely destroyed. The challenged report is designated NCSTAR 1 and runs some 298 pages. Dr. Judy Wood (formerly Professor of Mechanical Engineering at Clemson University) has lodged a Request For Correction, and a subsequent appeal, with NIST, with the help of a Connecticut Attorney Jerry Leaphart. Dr. Morgan Reynolds, Professor (Emeritus) of Economics at Texas A & M University and former Chief Economist in the Dept. of Labor, also with the help of Jerry Leaphart, has initiated 2 separate actions against NIST.

The first action was initiated in March 2007 by Dr. Wood, in the form of a "Request For Correction" (RFC) which declares that the main NIST WTC report (NCSTAR1) is "fraudulent and deceptive" because it in no way accounts for the profound level of destruction of the WTC towers – as illustrated in a collection of over 65 photographs she has presented. Dr. Wood states that "NIST cannot make a statement that the World Trade Center towers came down in 'free fall' on one hand", and then say "that doing so is a form of collapse." Wood also states that "Use of the descriptive word 'collapse' is incorrect and Wood points out that according to NIST's own data, their explanation of how the towers were pulverised does not satisfy the laws of Physics. Dr. Wood, concludes from her study, that some type of Directed Energy Weapon was used to destroy most of the WTC buildings. Dr. Wood also points out that Applied Research Associates (ARA) were involved in the production of some aspects of the NCSTAR reports and that they are a manufacturer of Directed Energy Weapons and/or components of same. This therefore would be one example of where there was a "conflict of interest" in producing a truthful report.

Even though NIST was supposed to have responded to each RFC within 60 days, an "extension of review" notification was posted on 29th June 2007 for both Dr. Wood's and Dr. Reynolds' RFC's.

Then, in a letter dated 27 July 2007, Catherine Fletcher of NIST rejected Dr. Wood's original RFC, stating "NIST has examined the photographs you provided in conjunction with all the other evidence and has found that the evidence does not support a theory involving directed energy weapons." Fletcher also stated, "...ARA was determined not to have an organizational conflict of interest". Finally Fletcher stated, "In conclusion, NIST is denying your request for correction because the NIST analysis of the initiation of the collapse of the WTC towers was thorough and based on all of the available evidence, and NIST continues to believe that the report is not fraudulent, deceptive or misleading."

The Data Quality Act, however, includes a "right of appeal" against the decision and Dr. Wood has worked to further document a significant conflict of interest between ARA and some of the analyses NIST used in their reports. In the appeal, dated August 22nd 2007, Dr. Wood makes 6

Search

Search

Disclosure/ET
9-11 and Fake Terror
Antigravity
Crop Circles
Energy
Mars & Solar System
Health Matters
Chemtrails
Consciousness
Moon Hoax

Recent Postings

- Vaccination: Hidden Truth
- A "Lengthy" Discussion of WTC Steel
- UK Muslim Leader Speaks out on 9/11, 7/7, Trilateral Commission and "Common Purpose"
- SOHO Image Analyses by ANON - UPDATED
- UK - Another Fall of Webs? 21 Oct 2007
- UK Spray Day 18th Oct 2007
- BBCi Derby Takes 1st step to Acknowledging Aircraft Trails/Chemtrails
- Yuri Gagarin - The 1st Man in Space - Right?
- Aircraft Trails - FOI Resonances
- Chemtrails-Press Release 3

We have 1 member online

Login Form

Username

Password

☐ Remember me

key assertions and states that "NIST should have known that Applied Research Associates (ARA) is a 'significant manufacturer of directed energy weapons and/or components thereof'". Additionally, Dr. Wood states "NIST should have detected evidence of the use of such weaponry even in the context of NIST's intentional and, I assert, improper limitation of its investigation into 'the sequence of events leading up to the 'collapse' of the World Trade Center (WTC) towers.'" A response to this appeal is now pending.

Login

Lost Password?

No account yet? Register

Dr. Reynolds' RFC outlines how NCSTAR1 failed to properly explain the observed damage caused by the supposed plane impacts. He challenges the true nature of the impacts based on a number of points of evidence. Reynolds states that NIST produced plane animations which showed "No significant deceleration as each jetliner entered a tower" and he points out that data used in the associated analysis is inconsistent.

Overall, considering the evidence discussed in NCSTAR1, Reynolds states: "These purported phenomena, [as mentioned above and as] described by NIST and its contractors, are not independently verifiable and do not have a scientifically valid basis for making the assumption that the simulated conditions could actually have occurred. Equally significant, the preparation of simulations that depict conditions that violate scientific principles serves only to mislead and to set the conditions for false conclusions to be enunciated."

NIST has still not issued a response to Dr. Reynolds' RFC - some 5 months later (only the "extension of review" notification).

In an action which is directly related to the RFC, Dr. Reynolds, also under the guidance of Jerry Leaphart, has now initiated a Law Suit against NIST. Dr. Reynolds' "Qui Tam" complaint, filed on 11th July 2007 in United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, lists 81 points in 7 "causes of action". The 34-page document is framed as Dr. Morgan O. Reynolds, on behalf of the United States of America vs Science Applications International Corp., Applied Research Associates, Inc., Boeing, Silverstein Properties, American Airlines, United Airlines and others. Its stated aim is to "recover treble damages and civil penalties under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-33 and to recover all available damages and other monetary relief under the common law or equitable theories of unjust enrichment, payment under mistake of fact, recoupment of overpayments and common law fraud."

The action charges that "defendants knowingly concealed, or failed to disclose, or caused others to fail to disclose material information" and that the reports produced "intentionally did not satisfy, the mandate that NIST had, which was that of determining what caused the destruction of WTC1,2."

It also charges that NIST's "documentation serves solely to mislead, obfuscate and provide a vehicle for the intended fraud; namely, that of steering NIST away from a consideration of what caused the destruction of WTC1,2; which, as elsewhere elaborated upon, was the use on 9/11/01 of exotic weaponry known as directed energy weapons."

Further developments in this case are now awaited.

For more information, contact the named individuals using the details below.

Jerry Leaphart, Jerry V. Leaphart & Assoc., P.C. 8 West Street, Suite 203 Danbury, CT 06810
phone - (203) 825-6265 , fax - (203) 825-6256, e-mail: jsleaphart@cs.com

Dr. Judy Wood: lisajudy@nctv.com , www.drjudywood.com

Dr. Morgan Reynolds: econrn@suddenlink.net , www.nomoregames.net

Dr. Wood's RFC: http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST_RFC.html

Dr. Wood's Appeal: http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST_RFC.html#wood

Dr. Reynolds' RFC: http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST_RFC.html#reynolds

Dr. Reynolds' Qui Tam Action in full:

http://nomoregames.net/911/federal_case/07cv4612unsealedcomplaint.pdf

NIST's filings of the RFC's and responses, including separate actions by Edward Haas and James

Gourley can be found at:

http://www.ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/Information_Quality/PROD01_002619

Submit to News Services



statemeter.com

[Sign In](#) | [Sign Up](#) | [At](#)

PR LEAP

ACCELERATING SEARCH VISIBILITY

[Recent News](#) | [Local News](#) | [News by Category](#) | [News by Date](#)


Se

Over 2
to get

Professors Make Legal Challenges to NIST 9/11 World Trade Centre Report

DANBURY, CONNECTICUT September 07, 2007 Legal News

(PRLEAP.COM) 7th Sept, 2007 Hot Springs Village - Arkansas, Clemson-SC, Danbury-CT. In separate actions, 2 professors have initiated legal challenges to the report that supposedly explained how and why

 [PRINTER FRIENDLY](#) [RSS](#) [SHARE](#)

Contact
Andrew J
[Double-C](#)
[Email Do](#)
+441332

World Trade Centre towers 1 & 2 were destroyed on Sept 11 2001. Prof. Morgan Reynolds, with various evidence, challenges the assumption that large jet planes hit the towers. Prof. Wood has uncovered evidence which has allowed her to declare that NCSTAR1 is "fraudulent and deceptive".

In 2005, a number of reports were issued by NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) which were meant to explain how the World Trade Centre towers were completely destroyed. The challenged report is designated NCSTAR 1 and runs some 298 pages. Dr. Judy Wood (formerly Professor of Mechanical Engineering at Clemson University) has lodged a Request For Correction, and a subsequent appeal, with NIST, with the help of a Connecticut Attorney Jerry Leaphart. Dr. Morgan Reynolds, Professor (Emeritus) of Economics at Texas A & M University and former Chief Economist in the Dept. of Labor, also with the help of Jerry Leaphart, has initiated 2 separate actions against NIST.

The first action was initiated in March 2007 by Dr. Wood, in the form of a

"Request For Correction" (RFC) which declares that the main NIST WTC report (NCSTAR1) is "fraudulent and deceptive" because it in no way accounts for the profound level of destruction of the WTC towers – as illustrated in a collection of over 65 photographs she has presented. Dr. Wood states that "NIST cannot make a statement that the World Trade Center towers came down in 'free fall' on one hand", and then say "that doing so is a form of collapse." Wood also states that "Use of the descriptive word 'collapse'" is incorrect and Wood points out that according to NIST's own data, their explanation of how the towers were pulverised does not satisfy the laws of Physics. Dr. Wood, concludes from her study, that some type of Directed Energy Weapon was used to destroy most of the WTC buildings. Dr. Wood also points out that Applied Research Associates (ARA) were involved in the production of some aspects of the NCSTAR reports and that they are a manufacturer of Directed Energy Weapons and/or components of same. This therefore would be one example of where there was a "conflict of interest" in producing a truthful report.

Even though NIST was supposed to have responded to each RFC within 60 days, an "extension of review" notification was posted on 29th June 2007 for both Dr. Wood's and Dr. Reynolds' RFC's.

Then, in a letter dated 27 July 2007, Catherine Fletcher of NIST rejected Dr. Wood's original RFC, stating "NIST has examined the photographs you provided in conjunction with all the other evidence and has found that the evidence does not support a theory involving directed energy weapons." Fletcher also stated, "...ARA was determined not to have an organizational conflict of interest". Finally Fletcher stated, "In conclusion, NIST is denying your request for correction because the NIST analysis of the initiation of the collapse of the WTC towers was thorough and based on all of the available evidence, and NIST continues to believe that the report is not fraudulent, deceptive or misleading."

The Data Quality Act, however, includes a "right of appeal" against the decision and Dr. Wood has worked to further document a significant conflict of interest between ARA and some of the analyses NIST used in their reports. In the appeal, dated August 22nd 2007, Dr. Wood makes 6 key assertions and states that "NIST should have known that Applied Research

Associates (ARA) is a 'significant manufacturer of directed energy weapons and/or components thereof' Additionally, Dr. Wood states "NIST should have detected evidence of the use of such weaponry even in the context of NIST's intentional and, I assert, improper limitation of its investigation into 'the sequence of events leading up to the 'collapse' of the World Trade Center (WTC) towers.'" A response to this appeal is now pending.

Dr. Reynolds' RFC outlines how NCSTAR1 failed to properly explain the observed damage caused by the supposed plane impacts. He challenges the true nature of the impacts based on a number of points of evidence. Reynolds states that NIST produced plane animations which showed "No significant deceleration as each jetliner entered a tower" and he points out that data used in the associated analysis is inconsistent.

Overall, considering the evidence discussed in NCSTAR1, Reynolds states: "These purported phenomena, [as mentioned above and as] described by NIST and its contractors, are not independently verifiable and do not have a scientifically valid basis for making the assumption that the simulated conditions could actually have occurred. Equally significant, the preparation of simulations that depict conditions that violate scientific principles serves only to mislead and to set the conditions for false conclusions to be enunciated."

NIST has still not issued a response to Dr. Reynolds' RFC - some 5 months later (only the "extension of review" notification).

In an action which is directly related to the RFC, Dr. Reynolds, also under the guidance of Jerry Leaphart, has now initiated a Law Suit against NIST. Dr. Reynolds' "Qui Tam" complaint, filed on 11th July 2007 in United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, lists 81 points in 7 "causes of action". The 34-page document is framed as Dr.. Morgan O. Reynolds, on behalf of the United States of America vs Science Applications International Corp., Applied Research Associates, Inc., Boeing, Silverstein Properties, American Airlines, United Airlines and others. Its stated aim is to "recover treble damages and civil penalties under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-33 and to recover all available damages and other monetary relief under the common law or equitable theories of unjust enrichment,

payment under mistake of fact, recoupment of overpayments and common law fraud.”

The action charges that “defendants knowingly concealed, or failed to disclose, or caused others to fail to disclose material information” and that the reports produced “intentionally did not satisfy, the mandate that NIST had, which was that of determining what caused the destruction of WTC_{1,2}.”

It also charges that NIST’s “documentation serves solely to mislead, obfuscate and provide a vehicle for the intended fraud; namely, that of steering NIST away from a consideration of what caused the destruction of WTC_{1,2}; which, as elsewhere elaborated upon, was the use on 9/11/01 of exotic weaponry known as directed energy weapons.”

Further developments in this case are now awaited.

For more information, contact the named individuals using the details below.

Jerry Leaphart, Jerry V. Leaphart & Assoc., P.C. 8 West Street, Suite 203
Danbury, CT 06810 phone - (203) 825-6265 , fax – (203) 825-6256, e-mail:
jsleaphart@cs.com

Dr. Judy Wood: lisajudy@nctv.com, www.drjudywood.com

Dr. Morgan Reynolds: econrn@suddenlink.net , www.nomoregames.net

Dr. Wood’s RFC:
http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST_RFC.html

Dr. Wood’s Appeal:
http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST_RFC.html#wood

Dr. Reynolds’ RFC:
http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST_RFC.html#reynolds

Dr. Reynolds’ Qui Tam Action in full:

http://nomoregames.net/911/federal_case/07cv4612unsealedcomplaint.pdf

NIST's filings of the RFC's and responses, including separate actions by Edward Haas and James Gourley can be found at:

http://www.ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/Information_Quality/PROD01_002619

About This Release

If you have any questions regarding information in these press releases please contact the organization listed in the press release. Issuers of press releases and not PR Leap are solely responsible for the accuracy of the content.

and [Terms of Service](#).

Issuers of news releases are solely responsible for the accuracy of their content. [Copyright / IP Policy](#)



No More Games • Net — 9/11

Reynolds Makes a Federal Case of 9/11 — Sues NIST Contractors for 9/11 Plane Fraud

Morgan Reynolds
August 21, 2007

- Home
- Recent Articles
- Economics
- Politics
- 9/11
- Other Conspiracies

Summary:

Last month the U.S. District Court, Southern New York, unsealed a 9/11 case filed by Dr. Morgan Reynolds, thereby making the case public. Reynolds is suing on behalf of the United States of America after the U. S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York who represents "the government" declined to intervene in the case. The suit, a so-called qui tam case, alleges that the 9/11 contractors NIST hired to investigate destruction of the WTC Towers on 9/11 defrauded the U.S. government of substantial money by rendering bogus, impossible physical analysis and animations about how two hollow aluminum aircraft (allegedly Boeing 767s) flew into a steel/concrete tower and disappeared. Yet it can be easily demonstrated, after a great deal of hard work by dedicated 9/11 researchers, that no planes hit the towers. The office of Reynolds' attorney, Jerry V. Leapheart of Connecticut, is now serving(notifying) the defendants in the suit, including Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), Applied Research Associates (ARA), Boeing, American Airlines, United Airlines and Silverstein Properties. I will post new information on the case as developments warrant.

Unsealed Complaint PDF [here](#).

00198722

Visits to my site!

The 9/11 Files Topsites

Copyright Morgan Reynolds 2006+ unless otherwise specified. Distribution of and linking to the articles on this website is strongly encouraged, as long as the content is not manipulated or distorted in anyway.